## **CONNECTICUT LAW**



Published in Accordance with General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 26

**JOURNAL** 

December 24, 2019

178 Pages

## **Table of Contents**

## **CONNECTICUT REPORTS**

Carolina v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 334 C 909	83 84 84 83 2
discrimination in selection of juries and to propose necessary changes, discussed. State v. Moore, 334 C 275	75
graphic data in accordance with statute (§ 51-232 [c]) concerning the issuance of questionnaires to prospective jurors; certification improvidently granted.  State v. Palumbo (Order), 334 C 909.  State v. Pernell (Order), 334 C 910.  State v. Raynor, 334 C 264.  Assault first degree as accessory; conspiracy to commit assault first degree; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that record was inadequate to review defendant's challenge under Batson v. Kentucky (476 U.S. 79) to prosecutor's exercise of peremptory challenge to strike prospective juror; adoption of Appellate Court's well reasoned opinion as proper statement of certified issue and applicable law concerning that issue.  Volume 334 Cumulative Table of Cases	83 84 64
CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS	00
Alonso v. Munoz (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 901	77 <i>A</i> 65 <i>A</i>
(continued on next n	aae)

acques v. Jacques, 195 CA 59	as result of alleged deficient performance; claim that habeas court improperly rejected petitioner's claim that his trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by referring to petitioner as bully during closing argument; whether trial counsel's use of term bully during closing argument constituted sound trial strategy and, therefore, did not amount to deficient performance or fall below objective standard of reasonableness; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner had not proven prejudice; whether there was reasonable probability that, but for trial counsel's alleged deficient performance, result of criminal trial would have been dif-	
Contracts; breach of parties' marital separation agreement; mootness; claim that trial court erred by concluding that action was barred by applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-576 [a]) and determining that it lacked continuing jurisdiction to enforce parties' separation agreement; whether claim that plaintiff's breach of contract action was not barred by statute of limitations was moot where plaintiff failed to challenge independent ground for court's adverse ruling.  a Morte v. Darien (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 901	ferent.	01.4
trial court erred by concluding that action was barred by applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-576 [a]) and determining that it lacked continuing jurisdiction to enforce parties' separation agreement; whether claim that plaintiff's breach of contract action was not barred by statute of limitations was moot where plaintiff failed to challenge independent ground for court's adverse ruling.  a Morte v. Darien (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 901	Jacques v. Jacques, 195 CA 59	61A
a Morte v. Darien (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 901	trial court erred by concluding that action was barred by applicable statute of limitations (§ 52-576 [a]) and determining that it lacked continuing jurisdiction to enforce parties' separation agreement; whether claim that plaintiff's breach of contract action was not barred by statute of limitations was moot where plaintiff	
dichael D. v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 902		77A
Hichael D. v. Commissioner of Correction, 195 CA 6		
Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's trial counsel provided ineffective assistance in failing to challenge admission of pornographic magazine into evidence; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel's conduct in attempting to preclude magazine did not constitute deficient performance; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to request instruction that jury must unanimously agree on factual basis for each guilty verdict; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner failed to establish prejudice resulting from trial counsel's failure to request specific unanimity instruction.  Cossell v. Rossell (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 902		
Vexatious litigation; breach of contract; slander of title; intentional interference with contract; breach of fiduciary duty; claim that trial court improperly determined that defendants breached general release by pursuing civil action against plaintiffs; failure to brief claim adequately; claim that trial court improperly found that defendants slandered plaintiffs title to certain property by filing lis pendens and affidavit of fact pertaining to property on certain land records; whether trial court, as trier of fact, was free to discredit evidence provided at trial; whether this court was persuaded that trial court's finding of slander of title was either legally incorrect or factually unsupported; claim that trial court improperly found that defendants intentionally interfered with plaintiff's contract to sell certain property to third party; claim that trial court improperly awarded interest on amount held in escrow; whether defendants failed to brief argument beyond mere abstract assertion; claim that there was insufficient evidence for trial court to find that interference caused any actual loss; claim that trial court	Habeas corpus; claim that petitioner's trial counsel provided ineffective assistance in failing to challenge admission of pornographic magazine into evidence; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel's conduct in attempting to preclude magazine did not constitute deficient performance; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to request instruction that jury must unanimously agree on factual basis for each guilty verdict; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner failed to establish prejudice resulting from trial counsel's failure to request specific unanimity instruction.	
Vexatious litigation; breach of contract; slander of title; intentional interference with contract; breach of fiduciary duty; claim that trial court improperly determined that defendants breached general release by pursuing civil action against plaintiffs; failure to brief claim adequately; claim that trial court improperly found that defendants slandered plaintiff's title to certain property by filing lis pendens and affidavit of fact pertaining to property on certain land records; whether trial court, as trier of fact, was free to discredit evidence provided at trial; whether this court was persuaded that trial court's finding of slander of title was either legally incorrect or factually unsupported; claim that trial court improperly found that defendants intentionally interfered with plaintiff's contract to sell certain property to third party; claim that trial court improperly awarded interest on amount held in escrow; whether defendants failed to brief argument beyond mere abstract assertion; claim that there was insufficient evidence for trial court to find that interference caused any actual loss; claim that trial court		
	Vexatious litigation; breach of contract; slander of title; intentional interference with contract; breach of fiduciary duty; claim that trial court improperly determined that defendants breached general release by pursuing civil action against plaintiffs; failure to brief claim adequately; claim that trial court improperly found that defendants slandered plaintiffs title to certain property by filing lis pendens and affidavit of fact pertaining to property on certain land records; whether trial court, as trier of fact, was free to discredit evidence provided at trial; whether this court was persuaded that trial court's finding of slander of title was either legally incorrect or factually unsupported; claim that trial court improperly found that defendants intentionally interfered with plaintiff's contract to sell certain property to third party; claim that trial court improperly awarded interest on amount held in escrow; whether defendants failed to brief argument beyond mere abstract assertion; claim that there was insufficient evidence for trial court to find that interference caused any actual loss; claim that trial court	23A

(continued on next page)

## CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes  $\S$  51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications Office of Production and Distribution 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178 www.jud.ct.gov

Richard J. Hemenway,  $Publications\ Director$ 

 $Published\ Weekly-Available\ at\ \underline{\text{https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal}}$ 

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by Eric M. Levine, Reporter of Judicial Decisions Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

notice of hearing in accordance with rules of practice; whether defendants demonstrated that due process rights were violated or that trial court committed reversible error in calculating amount of punitive damages; whether record demonstrated that defendants had ample notice of hearing on punitive damages.  State v. Bradley, 195 CA 36  Sale of controlled substance; violation of probation; claim that trial court erred in denying motions to dismiss charges; whether defendant, who is Caucasian, lacked standing to raise claim that his prosecution under Connecticut's statutes criminalizing possession and sale of marijuana violated his rights under equal protection clause of United States constitution because such statutes were enacted for illicit purpose of discriminating against persons of African-American and Mexican descent; whether trial court misapplied rule set forth in State v. Long (268 Conn. 508); whether defendant demonstrated that he had personal interest that had been or could be injuriously affected by alleged discrimination in enactment of relevant statute (§ 21a-277 [b]); whether defendant's claim alleged specific injury to himself beyond that of general interest of all marijuana sellers facing conviction under § 21a-277 (b); whether balancing of factors set forth in Powers v. Ohio (499 U.S. 400) pertaining to third-party standing weighed against defendant having standing to raise equal protection claim on behalf of racial and ethnic minorities who possessed constitutional rights that were allegedly violated; whether relationship between defendant and subject minority groups was close; whether there existed hindrance to ability of criminal defendant who is member of racial or ethnic minority group charged under § 21a-277 (b) from asserting his or her own constitutional rights in his or her own criminal prosecution.  State v. Colon (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 902.  State v. Tanner (Memorandum Decision), 195 CA 901  Volume 195 Cumulative Table of Cases	78A 3A 77A 79A
NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES	
DSS—TANF Caseload Reduction Report	1B 1B
MISCELLANEOUS	
Electronic Publication of Orders of Notice in Civil and Family Cases Notice of Suspension of Attorney and Appointment of Trustee	1C 1C
CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL NOTICE DEADLINES	
Revised Law Journal Dates for Notices 2020	1D